

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#89 A

October 11, 1999

Dear Beau,

I have not yet received your answer to my letter #87, but while I'm waiting for it, I'll answer some points from your recent letters.

9/24/99, p. 4, ¶3. You write, "My feeling has been that the kinds of changes that you might want to make at this point (if any) would be small."

Yet, without consulting me, or even giving me any prior notification, you introduced major deletions of quoted material, and of material that Miller apparently considered potentially libelous, going far beyond the deletions that I had already approved. Knowing as you did that it was very important to me that the book should be solidly documented, how could you assume that I would accept all this without wanting to change any of it?

9/24/99, p. 4, ¶4. Thanks for reassuring me that you will respect the terms of our contract.

9/24/99, p. 5, P.P.S. Since I'm still very sore at you, this is not a propitious time for congratulating you on your engagement, but I'll make an effort to sort of squash down my resentment just long enough to congratulate you anyway. As for [redacted], I'm not sure whether I should offer her my congratulations or my commiseration, but I'll try to be optimistic and offer her my congratulations. Okay, I apologize for the acid humor.

9/30/99, p. 1, ¶2. After further consultation with Q. Denvir, I've concluded that there will

be no very serious risk in quoting the 1979 Autobiography. I am "having second thoughts about the entire project," to use your expression, but it's not because of any legal risks, it's because I'm just burned out. I'm sick to death of all this shit.* So much so that for more than a week I've been finding it extremely difficult to force myself to put pen to paper for any other purpose than to write purely social letters. And now, after I've spent a vast amount of time and energy in corresponding with you during a year and some odd months, it may turn out that it will be all for nothing, because it's not clear that we will ever reach agreement on the conditions of publication.

9/24/99, p.4, ¶3, and 9/30/99, p.1, ¶2. You write that you "assumed that [you] had [my] faith at this point," and that you "overestimated [my] sense of [your] reliability." If you'll stop and think for a moment, you'll see why I have not been very impressed with your reliability. For example, you wrote me on 10/22/98, "We [B. Friedlander + attorney] went over all of the points that he felt could present stumbling blocks [with regard to libel issues] and found that they were mirages;" on 10/29/98, "I do think I put the libel issue to rest in my letter of the 21st...;" on 11/4/98, "I understand the libel issue to be a moot one..." This

* Not just the problems with the book, but a lot of others.

seems clearly to say that no changes in the book, or at least no significant ones, would be required because of libel problems. Yet you later did ask for significant deletions or other changes because of libel risks. Put yourself in my position: Would this encourage you to have confidence in your correspondent's reliability?

Contrary to my advice (letter # 53, 5/31/99, p. 1, ¶ 2) you kept announcing publication dates for Truth versus Lies (first June, then August, then September, then October) without apparently considering whether there was any certainty that you would actually be able to meet those dates. No wonder people now doubt that the book will ever be published. Put yourself in the position of an outside observer; Would you have confidence in the reliability of a person who kept announcing dates and then failing to meet them?

My personal opinion is that you do things in too much of a damned hurry, which results in sloppiness, careless judgments, or careless statements, hence in the appearance or reality of unreliability. It may be that your hurried style of action is necessary for your success in business, but from my point of view it is a source of problems.

* * *

By the way, because my anger has cooled considerably, because of what you've written me in your latest letters, and because of

4
good things that has said concerning you, I no longer suspect you of intentionally bullshitting me about the extent of the legal changes that would have to be made in Truth vs Lies; I think the difficulties we have are the result of your excessive haste, with consequent carelessness. But I see no reason why this would have had to happen if you had taken my advice (#53, 5/31/99, p. 1, #2) and refrained from subjecting us to time constraints before we had all the problems worked out. Then there would have been no need for haste.

* * *

Your letter of 10/4/99. Thanks for reassuring me about the nature of your publicity efforts. Regarding , in #86 I said that she had tried to peddle her article to the Boston Globe and possibly to Harper's.

had given me that impression, but it turns out that it is false. a has explained that, at the request of the editors of Green Anarchist, she had only called the attention of a Globe reporter to the article in Green Anarchist and read him a statement on the subject, of which she sent me a copy. So I don't see that she is seriously at fault here.

I've seen no clear signs that has an excessive appetite for publicity. You and tell me that she does, but you've given me no solid evidence of it, so I remain skeptical. Or

rather, I've again become skeptical since learning that she did not after all offer her article to the Globe.

* * *

Did you get from Dubner copies of the tapes of our interview? If so, I would appreciate it if you would send copies of them to Quin Denvir. Also, I would appreciate receiving a copy of Dubner's article.

* * *

On the dust jacket of Truth versus Lies you wrote, "In Truth versus Lies, Kaczynski particularly states the case against allegations that he is a paranoid schizophrenic." This is false, and please do not say it! It would give people the impression that what's in Truth versus Lies is the best I can do against the claim of paranoid schizophrenia, which is not at all true. The purpose of Truth versus Lies is only to refute some of the bullshit that my family and the media have spread about me. A proper argument on the schizophrenia question would include an examination of the shrinks' reports and the reasons for doubting the validity of those reports. Truth vs Lies simply does not address the schizophrenia issue, even though it does contain material that has a bearing on that issue.

* * *

As for Ulveman — ask about him. She knows more than I do about that

matter,

Best regards,

Ted